

PTO/SB/83 (01-06)

Approved for use through 12/31/2008. OMB 0651-0035
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL AS ATTORNEY OR AGENT AND CHANGE OF **CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS**

· ·		
Application Number	09/899,425	
Filing Date	July 5, 2001	
First Named Inventor	John J. Larkin	
Art Unit	3626	
Examiner Name	GOTTSCHALK, Martin A.	
Attorney Docket Number	NPA 2 0002	

To: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450						
Please withdraw me as atto	Please withdraw me as attorney or agent for the above identified patent application, and					
all the attomeys/agen	ts of record.					
the attorneys/agents (with registration numbers) list	ed on the attach	ned paper(s), or			
the attorneys/agents a	associated with Customer Nur	mber				
NOTE: This box can only be checked when the power of attorney of record in the application is to all the practitioners associated with a customer number.						
The reasons for this request are	E Attached.					
Applicant has more than sixty (60) days to respond						
	CORRESPOND	ENCE ADD	RESS			
1. The correspondence address is NOT affected by this withdrawal.						
2. Change the correspondence address and direct all future correspondence to: Below The address associated with Customer Number:						
Firm or Individual Name	Solutions, Ltd.					
Address 2967 N	lationwide Parkway					
City Brunsv	vick	State OH		Zip 44212		
Country US	-					
Telephone	201		Email			
Signature Vutual	Mobile	1				
Name Patrick R. Roche	-		Registration No.	29,580		
Date Carril 24	, 2006		Telephone No.	216.861.5582		
NOTE: Withdrawal is effective when appr date of a time period for response or poss				al of withdrawal and the expiration		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.36. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S)

John J. Larkin, et al.

TITLE

METHOD FOR CLAIMS MANAGEMENT OF

WORKPLACE-RELATED INJURIES

APPLICATION NO.

09/899,425

FILED

July 5, 2001

CONFIRMATION NO.

3355

EXAMINER

GOTTSCHALK, Martin A

ART UNIT

3626

LAST OFFICE ACTION

January 18, 2006

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

NPA 2 00002

ATTACHMENT TO REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL AS ATTORNEY OR AGENT

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The attorneys/agents of record of the subject application request withdrawal for not receiving any cooperation or instructions for the continued prosecution of the application. In addition, the attorneys/agents are long overdue payment for the services of the preparation and filing of the application.

CERTIFICATE OF FIRST CLASS MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail service and is addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alegandria, VA 22313-1450.

Cathryn Terchek

Date: 64 206

Concerning the failure of the applicant to communicate with the attorneys/agents of record, attached as Exhibit A is a copy of the certified mail letter dated February 9, 2006 which accompanied the report of the Office Action mailed January 18, 2006. The letter was addressed to the CEO of the assignee of the subject application, who is also one of the co-inventors, Mr. Donald Seddon. Mr. Seddon signed for receipt of the certified mail letter and package on February 11, 2006 (Exhibit B). The letter advised Mr. Seddon that in order to proceed it would be very important that the inventors review the Examiner's comments and the references and provide a suggestion to the attorneys/agents for an appropriate response. No response or instructions were ever received from the applicant. Thereafter a voicemail message was left with Mr. Donald Seddon on March 28, 2006 further requesting instructions, and another voice mail message was left with another coinventor, Tom Seddon, on April 17, 2006.

Exhibit C is a copy of another certified mail letter, mailed on April 18, 2006, advising the applicant that failure to respond to our request for instructions would be considered by us as instruction to abandon the application. Mr. Donald Seddon signed for this certified mail letter on April 19, 2006 (Exhibit D). However, the applicant was further advised that with appropriate extension of time fees, a response could still be mailed up to three months after April 18, 2006.

Lastly, the attorneys/agents have not been paid by the applicant for the services in the preparation and filing of the subject application.

For all of the above reasons, it is essentially impossible for the presently empowered attorneys/agents of record of the subject application to continue to prosecute and represent the applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH& McKEE, LLP

Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580

1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor

Cleveland, OH 44114-2579

216-861-5582

Carri 24, 2006



FAY. SHARPE. FAGAN. MINNICH & MCKEE. LLP

PATENT TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW

MARK E. BANDY
JOHN P. CORNELY
JOSEPH D. DREHER
JUDE A. FRY
STEVEN M. HAAS
MICHAEL E. HUDZINSKI
RICHARD M. KLEIN
THOMAS E. KOCOVSKY, JR.
SANDRA M. KOENIG
SCOTT A. MCCOLLISTER
JAY F. MOLDOVANYI
PHILIP J. MOY, JR.
TIMOTHY E. NAUMAN

PATRICK R. ROCHE
JAMES E. SCARBROUGH
ANN M. SKERRY, PH.D.
MARK S. SVAT
BRIAN E. TURUNG
GREGORY S. VICKERS
ROBERT V. VICKERS

OF COUNSEL
E. KENT DANIELS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER B. FAGAN
JAMES W. MCKEE
RICHARD J. MINNICH
THOMAS E. YOUNG

1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE

SEVENTH FLOOR

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-2579

TELEPHONE (216) 861-5582

FAX (216) 241-1666

WEB: www.faysharpe.com

MATTHEW P. DUGAN
KEVIN M. DUNN
PATRICK D. FLOYD
COLLEEN FLYNN GOSS
KARL W. HAUBER
ERIC M. HIGHMAN
ERIC W. LEE
ERIK J. OVERBERGER
SUE ELLEN PHILLIPS
ROBERT A. SIDOTI
ROBERT M. SIEG, PH.D.
SCOTT M. SLABY
ALEXANDER P. TSAROUHAS

JOSEPH E. WATERS
JONATHAN A. WITHROW
JEFFREY N. ZAHN
MARINA V. ZALEVSKY
JOHN S. ZANGHI

REGISTERED PATENT AGENTS
ANTHONY M. DEL ZOPPO, III
THOMAS TILLANDER
GUOSHENG WANG, PH.D.

ALBERT P. SHARPE, III

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL/Confirmation by E-Mail

deseddon@nupathtech.com

February 9, 2006

Patrick R. Roche proche@faysharpe.com

Mr. Donald Seddon Nupath Solutions, Ltd. 2967 Nationwide Parkway Brunswick, Ohio 44212

Response to Office Action Due In U.S. Patent Office By: April 18, 2006

Re:

U.S. Patent Application of Nupath Solutions (Cincinnati), Ltd.

Title: METHOD FOR CASE MANAGEMENT

OF WORKPLACE-RELATED INJURIES

Inventors: John J. Larkin, et al.

Ser. No.: 09/899,425; Filed: July 5, 2001

Our Ref.: NPA 2 00002

Dear Don:

Attached for your review and consideration is an Office Action mailed from the U.S. Patent Office on January 18, 2006. Also enclosed are the references of record cited by the Examiner in support of the Office Action. I had left you a voice-mail message on this matter on January 26 and have not yet heard back from you.

We are sorry, but not surpirised, to have to report that upon first review, the Examiner has failed to appreciate that any of the claims define patentable subject matter for the stated reasons that the claimed subject matter is either anticipated by or fails to define nonobvious subject matter over selected teachings drawn from the cited references.

Mr. Donald Seddon February 9, 2006 Page 2

It is not unusual to receive a first Office Action rejecting the application and we now have an opportunity to respond by challenging the conclusions and arguments of the Examiner, and/or by amending our present claim definitions to better distinguish the subject invention over the teachings of the prior art references. In order to proceed, it is very important that the inventors review the Examiner's comments and the references, and provide to us suggestions for an appropriate response. The response is due by **April 18, 2006**.

It has been many years since we have heard from you on this project. Unfortunately, the Patent Office is considerably backed up forthis type of subject matter and it is not unusual for such patent applications to take this long before receiving an initial Office Action. We still need your authorization and instructions to proceed. If you desire to do so, we will need to come to some accommodations on your long outstanding account.

After you have had an opportunity to review the subject material, we will appreciate hearing from you, preferably in a manner to facilitate the preparation of the response. Absent hearing from you in any way, we can only assume that you are no longer desirous of maintaining the pendency of this application. Without receiving a response at the U.S. Patent Office, the application will automatically expire, and without evidence of some very special circumstances, cannot be revived.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Patrick R. Roche

PRR:ct Enclosures

N:\NPAZ\200002\US\CNT0003235V001.doc



SENTER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY		
Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. 1. Article Addressed to: Mr. Donald Seddon Nupath Solutions, Ltd.	A. Signature X		
2967 Nationwide Parkway Brunswick, Ohio 44212	3. Service Type Certified Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D. 4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) Yes		
2. Art Number (fi. ,r from service label)	To The Carlot of the Control of the		
PS Form 3811, August 2001 Domestic Retu			



JOSEPH D. DREHER JUDE A. FRY STEVEN M. HAAS MICHAEL E. HUDZINSKI RICHARD M. KLEIN THOMAS E. KOCOVSKY, JR. SANDRA M. KOENIG SCOTT A. MCCOLLISTER JAY F. MOLDOVANYI PHILIP J. MOY, JR. TIMOTHY E. NAUMAN

FAY. SHARPE. FAGAN. MINNICH & MCKEE. LLP

PATENT TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW

PATRICK R. ROCHE JAMES E. SCARBROUGH ANN M. SKERRY, PH.D. MARK S. SVAT BRIAN E. TURUNG GREGORY S. VICKERS ROBERT V. VICKERS

E. KENT DANIELS, JR. CHRISTOPHER B. FAGAN RICHARD J. MINNICH

1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE SEVENTH FLOOR

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-2579

TELEPHONE (216) 861-5582 FAX (216) 241-1666

WEB: www.faysharpe.com

MATTHEW P. DUGAN KEVIN M. DUNN PATRICK D. FLOYD COLLEEN FLYNN GOSS KARL W. HAUBER ERIC M. HIGHMAN ERIC W. LEE ERIK J. OVERBERGER SUE ELLEN PHILLIPS ROBERT A. SIDOTI ROBERT M. SIEG, PH.D.

SCOTT M. SLABY

JOSEPH E. WATERS JONATHAN A. WITHROW JEFFREY N. ZAHN MARINA V. ZALEVSKY JOHN S. ZANGHI

REGISTERED PATENT AGENTS ANTHONY M. DEL ZOPPO.III THOMAS TILLANDER GUOSHENG WANG, PH.D.

ALBERT P. SHARPE, III 1959-2001

ALEXANDER P. TSAROUHAS THOMAS E. YOUNG VIA CERTIFIED MAIL/Confirmation by E-Mail

deseddon@nupathtech.com

April 18, 2006

Patrick R. Roche proche@faysharpe.com

Mr. Donald Seddon Nupath Solutions, Ltd. 2967 Nationwide Parkway Brunswick, Ohio 44212

Response to Office Action Due In U.S. Patent Office By: April 18, 2006

Re:

U.S. Patent Application of Nupath Solutions (Cincinnati), Ltd.

Title: METHOD FOR CASE MANAGEMENT OF WORKPLACE-RELATED INJURIES

Inventors: John J. Larkin, et al.

09/899,425; Ser. No.:

Filed: July 5, 2001

Our Ref.: NPA 2 00002

Dear Don:

Further to my letter to you of February 9, 2006, we must assume that you have decided to abandon this patent application in accordance with the conditions outlined in our earlier letter. We need the assistance of you and/or the other co-inventors in order to prepare an appropriate response. The response is due in the Patent Office by April 18, 2006. In addition, I left a voice mail in your message box on March 28, 2006, and left another one in your brother Tom's message box on April 17, 2006.

We are very sorry and bewildered by your failure to provide any instructions whatsoever, the least of which should be to confirm the abandonment of the application. We believe that you were happy with the earlier work and that your company, at least what we can note from your website, appears to be viable.

Mr. Donald Seddon April 18, 2006 Page 2

We will hold your file materials in our disposed and abandoned application files. If you would like them, please advise.

Lastly, if you should change your mind, three months of extensions of time are available at the Patent Office with the appropriate payment of the extension fees.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Patrick R. Roche

PRR:ct



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY						
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also comitem 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reso that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the major on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to: Mr. Donald Seddon Nupath Solutions, Ltd. 2967 Nationwide Parkway Brunswick, Ohio 44212 	everse	C. Signat X D. Is deliv	dre de la company de la compan	s different fro	om item		
		☐ Reg	tified Mail gistered ured Mail	□ C.O.E	n Recei).	ipt for Merchandis	=
		4. Hestric	cted Deliver	ry? (Extra Fe	:e) 	☐ Yes	
Article Number (Copy from service la	7005	3770	0004	4604	670	ם כ	
DC Form 3811 July 1000	Domestic Ret	ırn Receint				102595-00-M-0952	,